

REMARKS

I. Status of the Application

Claims 9-28 are pending in this application. In the November 27, 2007 office action, the Examiner:

A. Objected to the drawings because the reference numeral '9' was used to designate both an offset register and a parser; and

B. Rejected all of claims 9-28 under 35 USC § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by US 6,356,951 to Gentry Jr (Gentry).

In this response, the applicant has amended the drawings and claim 13. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of the claims and requests reconsideration and allowance of the application based on the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

II. Objection to Drawings

The examiner objected to the use of the reference numeral '9' to designate both an offset register and a parser. Figure 1 has been amended so that the designation of the offset register in Figure 1 is now '8'. Support for the amendment can be found, for example, in page 8, line 2. Accordingly, the objection to the drawings is now moot.

III. Claims 9, 13 and 19

Claim 9 was rejected as being anticipated by Gentry. For the reasons discussed below, Gentry fails to teach, show or suggest each and every limitation of claim 9.

The system and method as claimed in claim 9 includes receiving a stream of interleaved data sections of a plurality of different packets, and processing the data stream in a section-by-section manner to extract data using received section identity information. As a non-limiting example, the claimed system may be used in an Ethernet switch to allow the switch to be configurable as a Fast Ethernet (FE) or a Gigabit Ethernet (GE) switch, as discussed in page 3 lines 8-21 of the present application. For an FE operation, the switch processes bytes arriving at different ports concurrently or at substantially the same time, i.e. as interleaved sections from different packets. This operation can be contrasted with the operation of conventional parsers, which are connected to individual switch ports and are configurable to only process one whole packet at a time.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite an interface similar to the interfaces in claims 9 and 19. Accordingly, the system in amended claim 13 includes an interface to receive a stream of interleaved data sections of a plurality of different packets, and a parsing unit to receive the data sections sequentially and to use offset information in one or more user-programmable registers to extract data from the data sections. As before, the ability to handle interleaved data sections of a packet allows concurrent processing of a number of packets at a time. Also, the use of a user-programmable offset register allows a user to program an offset into the system such that parsing is carried out on the portion of the packets corresponding to the user-programmed offset.

The examiner contends that Gentry anticipates all of the claims pending in this application. In summary, Gentry discloses the following processes for parsing a packet:

- a. Receive an entire packet and store the packet in queue (column 16 lines 66-67)

- b. Copy the packet's header portion into a header memory (column 17 lines 9-10).
- c. Initiate parsing of the copied header portion on the basis that the header portion begins with the Layer 2 protocol header (column 17 lines 21-24). The actual packet itself is maintained in a queue, and is not parsed (column 17 lines 17-20)

The examiner contends that Gentry teaches the feature of 'an interface configured to receive a data stream composed of interleaved sections of a plurality of different packets' in column 16 lines 65 to column 17 line 2, and column 17 lines 8-20. This contention is respectfully traversed. All Gentry teaches in the columns referenced above is receiving *a packet* that includes a header portion (i.e. a whole packet), not receiving *interleaved sections of a plurality of different packets* as claimed.

The examiner also contends that Gentry teaches the feature of receiving 'section identity information about each of the sections of data defining to which packet it relates' in column 17 lines 8-20. The examiner supports this contention by equating the packet headers of Gentry with the claimed section identity information. The applicant respectfully traverses this contention. The claimed section identity information defines to which packet each of the received interleaved data sections relates. As established earlier, Gentry does not receive interleaved data sections. Accordingly, there cannot be section identity information in Gentry. Even if, assuming for argument's sake, one considers Gentry's packet header to be a 'section of data', and the information contained in the header to be 'section identity information', Gentry still fails to disclose the present invention since Gentry does not receive interleaved packet headers of different packets (i.e. 'interleaved sections of a plurality of different

packets'). Alternatively, if one considers the packets received by Gentry to be composed of a header section and a payload section, Gentry would still fail to disclose receiving *interleaved* sections of a plurality of *different* packets since Gentry only receives the header and payload sections of one packet at a time.

The applicant submits that the above submissions establish that the discrepancies between the present claims and Gentry cannot be reconciled. This lack of reconcilability is unsurprising given that Gentry is based on the conventional technique of having to receive a *whole packet* before being able to process it, as compared to the present invention, which is capable of processing *interleaved sections of different packets* (i.e. packets that have been divided) sequentially or in a section-by-section manner as they are received.

For at least the above reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 9, 13 and 19 are not anticipated by Gentry. The remaining claims are also not anticipated at least by virtue of their direct or indirect dependency on claim 9, 13 or 19.

The applicant takes this opportunity to submit in advance that the invention claimed in the present claims is also non-obvious in view of Gentry. As established above, Gentry fails to teach or suggest a number of features of the claimed invention. There is also no motivation or prompt that would have caused the skilled person to provide those features, especially in view of the specific operational requirements of Gentry's parsing process. For example, the examiner will note that the parsing process of Gentry is crucially dependent on its reception of whole individual packets, each having a header portion. Specifically, once an individual packet is received by Gentry, its header portion is copied to memory such that the copied header portion immediately begins with the layer two protocol header (see column 17 lines 9-

24). Gentry, therefore, depends on the reception of a whole packet to be able to discern the structural features of the packet. Since Gentry does not teach or suggest other ways in which to discern the structural features of the packet, a skilled person would not be prompted to modify Gentry's header parsing process to work on anything other than whole packets, much less adapt Gentry's process for interleaved sections of different packets, which do not provide the clearly discernable structural features information on which Gentry's process is so crucially reliant.

V. Conclusion

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted the applicant has made a patentable contribution to the art. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

In the event applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for an extension of time or payment of an additional fee, the applicant conditionally petitions therefore, and authorizes any fee deficiency to be charged to deposit account 13-0014.

Respectfully submitted,



David R. Moorman
Attorney for Applicants
Attorney Registration No. 59,323
Maginot Moore & Beck
Chase Tower
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3250
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5109
Telephone: (317) 638-2922